

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-7, were rejected. Claims 1-4 and 6-7 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of 3GPP Document TS 25.331 v3.16.0 (2003-9) and Tohono. And, claim 5 was rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of the 3GPP Document, Tohono, and Laitanen.

In response to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended in manners believed better to distinguish the invention over the cited combination of references. New, independent claim 8 and dependent claims 9-10 are presented. And, claims 4-6 are cancelled.

With respect to exemplary claim1, the recitation of identifying is now amended to recite identifying if a same information element from each of the SIB 11 and the SIB 12 are each related to at least one cell information list. The claim is amended further to state that, if the same information elements are related to the at least one cell information list, then reading and acting upon the system information associated with the identified same information elements according to the defined order. And, the order is stated to specify reading and acting upon system information associated with the information element from the SIB 11 and then from the SIB 12. Claim 7 has been analogously amended, and new claim 8 recites analogous subject matter.

Support for the amendments is found, e.g., in paragraphs [0011] and [0027] of the specification. Support for the subject matter of claims 8-10 is also found in these paragraphs, in the claims, as originally-presented, and in paragraphs [0034] and [0037].

The Applicant asserts that the claims, as now presented, are patentably distinguishable over the cited combinations of references and, accordingly, traverses the claim rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied upon the 3GPP Document for receiving a system information block of Type 11 and a system information block of Type 12 and of identifying a same information element of each of SIB 11 and SIB 12.

The Examiner acknowledged that the 3GPP Document fails to teach arranging the user equipment device to apply certain received information elements in a defined order and applying a system information associated with the identified same information elements according to the defined order wherein the order defined in the user equipment device specifies that the system information associated with the information element from SIB 11 and then applying the same information associated with the information element from SIB 12. But, the Examiner relied upon Tohono for showing the applying of the certain received information elements in a defined order and for showing applying the system information associated with the same information elements.

The Applicant asserts that Tohono fails to disclose or to suggest that the user equipment device reads and acts upon the system information if the same information elements are related to the at least one cell information list, as now-recited. That is to say, Tohono does not attempt to identify whether cells have the same information elements.

And, the Applicant further asserts that Tohono also fails to disclose a defined order that specifies reading and acting upon system information associated with the information element from SIB 11 and then reading and acting upon the system information associated with the information element from SIB 12.

Tohono appears merely to be related to a CDMA scheme that attempts to provide more efficient searching signals from neighboring cells by listening to a paging channel by a UE. The UE makes measurements to determine which cell to which possibly to transfer if signals get weak. There is no disclosure of receipt of information from other cells by way of SIBs.

The Examiner stated Tohono teaches application in a defined order corresponding to the active cell, candidate cell, and hand-over cell. And, the Examiner stated that it is well known that an active cell or set corresponds to the idle mode and therefore corresponds to SIB 11.

The Applicant specifically traverses this statement. Each of the independent claims recites that SIB 11 relates to the idle and connected mode and that SIB 12 relates to the connected mode. SIB 11 does not relate only to the idle mode but, rather, to both the idle and connected modes. The active, candidate, and hand-over cells cannot, therefore, correspond to SIB 11 and/or SIB 12.

While the Examiner made explicit reliance upon paragraphs 56-59 of Tohono, these cited paragraphs fail to mention SIB 11 or SIB 12. And, Tohono does not elsewhere make any disclosure of system information relating to SIB 11 or SIB 12, let alone any correspondence between SIB 11 or 12 and the idle and connected mode or the connected mode.

Additionally, contrary to the Examiner's assertion that one skilled in the art would find it obvious to combine the teachings of the 3GPP document and Tohono, the Applicant believes that one skilled would conclude the lack of direction of in which order to apply the information that the invention is concerned is, instead, an indication that the claimed invention is unobvious.

Laitenan, which was cited in the rejection of dependent claim 5, was cited merely for showing a computer program product. This reference does not appear to be relevant to any of the independent claims.

As the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their parent claim, these claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references, in any combination, for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claim.

Additionally, new claim 8 is believed to be distinguishable over the combination of Tohono and the 3GPP Document for reasons analogous to those given above. Tohono fails to disclose determination of whether IEs from the SIBs relate to a same cell information list IE and, if so, applying the IEs in a specified order

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 7, as now-amended, as well as the dependent claims thereon, and newly-presented claim 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims, as presently presented, is therefore respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com